

teachers, nurses, police officers and factory workers.

Californians and Americans across this Nation must band together to stop this calculated attempt to stifle the voices of working people in our country.

NUCLEAR UTILITY INDUSTRY AND NUCLEAR WASTE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, America's favorite pastime, baseball, is upon us here in our Nation's Capital. However, the nuclear utility industry is striking out, and it seems they are becoming a backstop, rather than a leader for common sense.

Recently Secretary Pena pitched a proposal of up to \$5 billion for financial relief to utilities to cover on-site nuclear waste storage costs. Unfortunately, and yet to no one's surprise, the nuclear industry balked at the idea, even though the U.S. Court of Appeals denied the utility request ordering and directing the Energy Department to immediately begin accepting their nuclear waste.

Here was a chance for all Americans to hit that home run by keeping this deadly waste on-site, rather than endangering the lives and health of citizens across this Nation, transporting it through their communities. But, once again, the nuclear industry is holding out for a bigger contract, just so they can pad their pockets.

Mr. Speaker, the nuclear industry is trying to build an expensive taxpayer-paid expansion team, but Americans are not going to accept the unsafe and ridiculous curve balls this industry is throwing at America.

OPPOSE PROPOSITION 226

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to California's Proposition 226, aimed at curtailing labor union political influence, but which is written so broadly it would apply to a variety of organizations that are not labor unions. These could include employee associations of every kind, such as those representing nurses, social workers, law enforcement officers and physicians.

This initiative is so broad that it will keep labor unions and their members from expressing their point of view, not only on political matters, but on issues such as education, health care and retirement security. It imposes costly bureaucratic regulations on unions, which would make it more difficult for union members to come together and make their voices heard on government decisions that affect working families.

It is no coincidence that this initiative comes before California's voters after the AFL-CIO's aggressive education and mobilization efforts in 1996.

As a labor union member and former union organizer, I oppose this attempt to undermine workers' rights.

DEFENDING THE FIRST AMENDMENT

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment to the Constitution reads, "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech."

The First Amendment is America's most important political reform. As Americans, it is our most precious and sacred guarantee. That is why the founders put it at the very top of the list.

Mr. Speaker, it was political speech that the founders deemed most vital. Why? Because it was political speech that the British government tried to stifle when it was in power.

The Founding Fathers tried to prevent government suppression of political speech from ever happening again, by adopting the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. The framers of the Constitution did not explicitly or implicitly create a campaign speech exception to the First Amendment, as some Members of Congress now wish to do.

Mr. Speaker, under the First Amendment, Congress does not have the authority to regulate political speech. As long as we have any shred of a Constitution left, we are going to have the ability to act as individuals or as groups to engage in political expression, free of government intrusion.

□ 1100

DEFEAT PROPOSITION 226

(Mrs. TAUSCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, my fellow Californians will be voting on Proposition 226, a proposal to handicap the efforts of labor unions by limiting their ability to spend the dues they collect from their members.

While Prop 226 is designed to sound attractive to working families, its real purpose is to put an undue burden on union members. Prop 226 would force unions into the unworkable position of seeking written approval from their members each year before spending any of the money for political purposes.

Currently, union members who choose to restrict the use of their union dues for political purposes may do so. Prop 226 instead places the onerous burden of unnecessary paperwork requirements on the vast majority of union members who want their unions to act on their behalf. This require-

ment would limit the free speech of union workers and impose burdensome red tape on the unions.

This House recognized the folly of Prop 226 when it rejected similar legislation known as the Paycheck Protection Act most recently. I hope Californians will follow the House's lead by defeating Proposition 226.

CLINTON WHITE HOUSE AIDS IN CHINA'S MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM

(Mr. NEUMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to have taken 5 nuclear blasts in India, combined with stunning revelations about campaign contributions from Communist China into the Democrat Party to send America a wake-up call.

With each passing day, the China scandal gets bigger, more worrisome and more baffling. It is time the White House explains why it granted a waiver to the Loral Corporation and others who are helping China develop its missile and rocket programs.

Instead of trying to block high technology transfers to Communist China, this administration seems to be encouraging it. Instead of embarking on a national missile defense program for our country, for America, this administration is allowing the transfer of technology to help China develop missiles that may be aimed at the United States of America. Instead of making nuclear war less likely, this administration appears to be cooperating in making China a nuclear power.

The result? Well, India runs 5 nuclear bomb tests; Pakistan will likely follow; even Japan may inevitably reassess its own nuclear policy.

It is not a question if this technology will make the world a more dangerous place, it already has.

WAR ON DRUGS REQUIRES MORE THAN "NEIGHBORHOOD CRIME WATCH" MENTALITY

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today the House will cast the key vote on the war on drugs. The House will vote to either maintain the status quo and do nothing, or begin to fight.

Some of the misconceptions and untruths about the Traficant amendment: It will not mandate the use of troops; it will only allow it if the administration requests it, and if so, they must be specially trained, and they can only be deployed with civilian officers, and they cannot make arrests; local officials must be notified.

The substitute kills it. The substitute says, surveillance in intelligence only.

I say to my colleagues, neighborhood crime watches perform surveillance.